

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the remarks below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being unpatentable over Elberbaum (US 7171106 B2) in view of Monroe (US 6970183 B1). However, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Elberbaum and Monroe fails to teach every feature of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 13, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Elberbaum and Monroe fails to teach, suggest or otherwise render predictable related-video condition generating means for generating a related-video condition from additional information that was retrieved along with the base video from video storing means in response to a search key. By way of example, a person may search for the base video by entering one or more criteria such as a window of time in which the person is interested. The base video retrieving means retrieves the base video for this window of time, but also retrieves additional information about the subject captured in the base video, such as position information for example, that was stored with the base video. Based on this additional information retrieved with the base video, the related-video condition generating means can generate the claimed related-video condition. The video acquiring means can then acquire one or more related videos that satisfy the related-video condition from the video storing means for review by the person in addition to the base video.

Thus, the related-video condition generating means uses additional information retrieved along with the base video to acquire related video footage from the video storing means.

In contrast, Elberbaum is correctly acknowledged in the Office action as failing to teach the claimed related-video condition generating means, which Monroe is cited as teaching. However, the teachings of Monroe are concerned primarily with controlling a plurality of cameras while recording the video to provide comprehensive coverage of an area. Accessing the video database in Monroe is accomplished based on the search criteria specified by a user. The specified search criteria are used to retrieve all of the videos from the database in Monroe. Monroe, like Elberbaum, fails to teach means for generating a related-video condition to be used to acquire a video related to a base video using additional information retrieved from the video storing means with the based video.

Further with regard to claim 13, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Elberbaum and Monroe also fails to teach, suggest or otherwise render predictable video acquiring means for acquiring at least one related video that meets the related-video condition from the video storing means. Again, Elberbaum is correctly acknowledged in the Office action as failing to teach such a feature. However, the Office action explains that it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Monroe with those of Elberbaum to focus multiple cameras on a single event to get the most comprehensive coverage. It appears the focusing of the multiple cameras on an alarm event is interpreted to be the claimed acquiring of at least one related video that meets the related-video condition. However, Monroe is primarily concerned with capturing comprehensive video of an alarm event as it occurs instead of retrieving multiple videos of a recorded alarm event from a video storing means. Claim 13 requires acquiring at least one related video that meets the related-video condition from the video storing means. The cited

portions of Monroe describe focusing the cameras to acquire related videos with the cameras themselves instead of retrieving recorded videos from video storing means (i.e., being recorded into video storing means as opposed to retrieved from the video storing means).

With regard to claim 24, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Elberbaum and Monroe fails to teach, suggest or otherwise render predictable generating a related-video condition from the additional information retrieved with the base video from video storing means. As explained above, the failure of Elberbaum to teach such a feature is acknowledged in the Office action, and accessing the video database in Monroe is accomplished using the search criteria specified by a user. The specified search criteria are used to retrieve all of the videos from the database in Monroe. Monroe, fails to teach generating a related-video condition from the additional information concerning a location of a subject in the base video picked up by at least one of the plurality of imaging apparatuses retrieved with the base video from video storing means.

And for reasons analogous to those set forth above for claim 13, the combination of Elberbaum and Monroe also fails to teach, suggest or otherwise render predictable acquiring at least one related video that meets the related-video condition from the video storing means. Again, the cited portions of Monroe describe capturing live video using the cameras to be stored in the video storing means, not retrieving related video that meets the related-video condition from the video storing means.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Elberbaum and Monroe fails to teach every feature of claims 13 and 24 as required to maintain a rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Accordingly, withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

New claims 26-29 have been added by way of this amendment, and include features also not taught by the combination of Elberbaum and Monroe.

The remaining claims in the present application, specifically claims 14-23, are allowable for the limitations therein and for the limitations of the claims from which they depend.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: 37326.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: /donald j. firca, jr./
Donald J. Firca, Jr., Reg. No. 48140

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: December 29, 2010